

SEC. 2. ALLOWING SENATORS, COMMITTEES, LEADERSHIP OFFICES, AND OTHER OFFICES OF THE SENATE TO SHARE EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 114 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 4576) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a)” before “Notwithstanding”;

(2) by striking “position, each of” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “qualifying position if the aggregate gross pay from those positions does not exceed—

“(1) the maximum rate specified in section 105(d)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968 (2 U.S.C. 4575(d)(2)), as amended and modified; or

“(2) in a case where 1 or more of the individual’s qualifying positions are positions described in subsection (d)(2)(B), the maximum rate specified in section 105(e)(3) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1968 (2 U.S.C. 4575(e)(3)), as amended and modified.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b)(1) For an individual serving in more than 1 qualifying position under subsection (a), the cost of any travel for official business shall be paid by the office authorizing the travel.

“(2) Messages for each electronic mail account used in connection with carrying out the official duties of an individual serving in more than 1 qualifying position under subsection (a) may be delivered to and sent from a single handheld communications device provided to the individual for purposes of official business.

“(3)(A) For purposes of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the rate of basic pay for an individual serving in more than 1 qualifying position under subsection (a) shall be the total basic pay received by the individual from all such positions.

“(B) For an individual serving in more than one qualifying position under subsection (a), for purposes of the rights and obligations described in, or described in the provisions applied under, title II of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1311 et seq.) related to practices used at a time when the individual is serving in such a qualifying position with an employing office, the rate of pay for the individual shall be the individual rate of pay received from the employing office.

“(c)(1) If the duties of a qualifying position under subsection (a) include information technology services and support, an individual may only serve in the qualifying position and 1 or more additional qualifying positions under such subsection if the individual is in compliance with each information technology standard and policy established for Senate offices by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

“(2) Notwithstanding subsection (a), an employee serving in a qualifying position in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate or the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate may serve in an additional qualifying position only if—

“(A) the other qualifying position is with the other Office; or

“(B) the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate has approved the arrangement.

“(d) In this section, the term ‘qualifying position’ means a position that—

“(1) is designated as a shared position for purposes of this section by the Senator or other head of the office in which the position is located; and

“(2) is one of the following:

“(A) A position—

“(i) that is in the office of a Senator; and

“(ii) the pay of which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

“(B) A position—

“(i) that is in any committee of the Senate (including a select or special committee) or a joint committee of Congress; and

“(ii) the pay of which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate out of an appropriation under the heading ‘INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS’ or ‘JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE’, or a heading relating to a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

“(C) A position—

“(i) that is in another office (excluding the Office of the Vice President and the Office of the Chaplain of the Senate); and

“(ii) the pay of which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate out of an appropriation under the heading ‘SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES’.

“(D) A position—

“(i) that is filled pursuant to section 105 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1978 (2 U.S.C. 6311); and

“(ii) the pay of which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate out of an appropriation under the heading ‘MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS’.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect beginning on the day that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, Madam Speaker, we will consider bills relating to justice and civil rights: H.R. 1333, the NO BAN Act, which prevents origin-based discrimination against those seeking to visit our country to do business, see family, or engage in tourism, rejecting the previous administration’s policy of banning arrivals from predominantly Muslim countries; H.R. 1573, the Access to Counsel Act, which reaffirms key American principles of justice with regard to immigrants’ rights to counsel during status hearings; and then lastly,

H.R. 51, standing for the 51st State. H.R. 51 is the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, to admit the District of Columbia as a State and provide equal representation in Congress for its residents.

That will be our schedule for the week to come. The following 2 weeks in April will be our committee workweeks so that the committees can produce additional product for consideration on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I know, just yesterday, one of the Members of the House Democrat leadership team, Chairman NADLER, introduced a bill to pack the Supreme Court.

This is a proposal that we have seen in other countries. Unfortunately, it is in mostly socialist countries. If you look at some of the examples, in 2004, Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez packed his court, and the result was totalitarian dominance for his socialist regime. Congressman GIMENEZ, who himself fled Cuba, fled a communist regime, said just recently on court-packing:

Packing the courts is a tactic used by brutal dictatorships to consolidate the socialist power, which resulted in tens of thousands of court rulings in its favor, basically destroying the country.

I wanted to ask the gentleman, is that court-packing bill a bill that the majority is going to be bringing to the floor or even marking up in committee? I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I have not had a discussion with Mr. NADLER, but as the gentleman knows, we have a lot of work to do on the floor of the House of Representatives, and we intend to get that work done. We have not considered bringing to the floor the bill to which the gentleman refers.

Did the gentleman in his research find any instances in any authoritarian country where they refused to consider a constitutional appointee to their Supreme Court that the President, with 10 months on his term, sent down to the United States Senate or some other body in those countries?

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I haven’t read the Constitution of Venezuela, but I know in the Constitution of the United States, it actually gives the Senate the advise-and-consent role, the responsibility, as it relates to Supreme Court picks. Obviously, that has been kept.

The borking incident was probably the most embarrassing, egregious abuse that started this back-and-forth, where individual Supreme Court picks became more personally scrutinized. That process has been abused in cases like Bork.

Even the Kavanaugh hearing got out of control, where disgraceful false allegations were made.

But in the end, the Senate’s advise-and-consent role is part of the United States Constitution. I don’t know if the gentleman is suggesting that that

should be changed. I don't see it. Even with a Democratic majority right now, I wouldn't suggest changing that process that is in our Constitution.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I don't know about the Nadler bill, but I do know that the Constitution says nothing about the Senate's ability to simply refuse to consider an appointee of the President of the United States. I don't think the Founders had any concept that that would be the case when they gave the power of appointment to the President of the United States.

□ 1230

And then when that occurred, when the present Attorney General was appointed to the Supreme Court, MITCH MCCONNELL said, We are not going to consider it, ten months before the end of the term of a President of the United States. And then they said the reason being is because we have an election coming up in just a few months—in that case, it was 8 months—and the next President ought to appoint.

Madam Speaker, that deep principle enunciated by Mr. MCCONNELL, by Mr. GRAHAM, and others—who was the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that deep principle was abandoned immediately when it became politically pragmatic for the Republican Party to do so and steal a Supreme Court justice.

So he can talk about socialism all he wants. What a distraction that is. A failure to want to discuss on the merits of the issues.

So what do they do, Madam Speaker? They talk about socialism or communism or dictatorship, none of which we have in the United States of America.

Now, we just lost a President of the United States that, in my experience—and I have served with many Presidents of the United States—was the most authoritarian-seeking President with whom I have served.

Madam Speaker, so I tell my friend that we are going to focus on issues important to the American people. We want to pass a jobs bill to make sure that America is competitive in the 21st century. We want to pass a jobs bill to make sure that families have good-paying jobs that they can support themselves and their families. We want to support bills that build America back better. I want an America that makes sure that everybody can “make it in America,” not only manufacture it in America but make it in America. That is what we are going to be focused on.

Madam Speaker, we hope that the debate is on the merits of those proposals, not some aspersion of some ideological tinge that they may think their supporters regale at.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding back. This is the bill. It is not even a page

and a half, but the real change in law by the Member of House Democratic leadership Chairman NADLER, says, “A Chief Justice of the United States and 12 Associate Justices, any eight of whom shall constitute a quorum.” So in essence, a hostile takeover of the United States Supreme Court, not going through the traditional process that has been in place for over 100 years.

And I think the gentleman knows, if you go back historically, the President in power when the Senate was led by a different party—I can't recall a case in generations where if in the election year there was a vacancy in the Supreme Court it was filled.

And everybody in the country knew that that was an issue in the election of 2016. In fact, it was probably one of the deciding issues that helped elect President Trump, was that there was that vacancy and the public wanted to be engaged in the direction of the country, as well as the direction of the court. It was absolutely a heavily debated item in the 2016 Presidential election and President Trump won that election.

But, again, I have never heard anybody suggesting changing the Constitution to take away the Senate's advise and consent role. But we do see here a bill that was filed just this week by a leader in the Democratic Party to have a hostile takeover of the Supreme Court, similar to what has been done in socialist countries. And I think it is important to point to who has proposed those kinds of changes in the past, and what it has led to. And I know President Biden himself is on the record many times criticizing heavily the idea of packing the Supreme Court.

Now, that was before he was President. Now that it would be him that would be able to appoint these extra judges, I don't know if his position has changed. But it is a dangerous precedent. It is the kind of precedent that exists in Soviet-style nations. I sure hope it is not here.

But Mr. NADLER did just say yesterday when asked about Speaker PELOSI's position, he said, “Speaker PELOSI and others will come along.” So I was just wondering if that was something that the gentleman was planning on bringing to the floor that would be a divisive issue as opposed to things that we could work together on, like infrastructure, that would be unifying.

And obviously, there is a lot of talk about infrastructure. This is something that there is tremendous interest in on both sides of the aisle. I know Chairman DEFAZIO, as well as Ranking Member SAM GRAVES, have had a lot of conversations about things that we could agree on. And I would hope that that would be the approach that we take, unlike the bill that over 90 percent of which had nothing to do with the COVID—the \$1.9 trillion spending bill, which was hyper-partisan.

Madam Speaker, I hope we approach this in a bipartisan way. Because as I

said, there are clearly Members on both sides that want to agree on an infrastructure bill and have lots of areas of agreement if we are talking about infrastructure. And by infrastructure, I think most Americans—if you asked them what they thought was infrastructure, they would say roads, bridges, ports, waterways, and broadband.

Once you get into social policy and Green New Deal-type policies or tax hikes that would make America the highest rate above Communist China in terms of tax policy—the National Association of Manufacturers said that the kind of proposal that is being floated in the partisan approach would kill over 1 million American jobs.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland talking about jobs. Why would we want to approach this in such a partisan way that we would threaten millions of jobs, that we would make America uncompetitive again, and Communist China would have a lower tax rate than America? Hopefully, we do the bipartisan approach and not a partisan approach.

And I yield to the gentleman to enlighten us on what direction is being approached right now.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman refers to Communist China, apparently wants to follow that example. A communist authoritarian government that owns most of the manufacturing capability in China—not all of it. It is ironic that in two different debates in less than 5 minutes that the gentleman would point to China as the example of what perhaps we ought to do, when their tax policy is approximately 100 percent, except what they want to allow their citizens to have.

Madam Speaker, let me just close on that point with: The Supreme Court has been packed.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Finally, I want to bring up the crisis that our Nation is facing at our southern border. And this has been a crisis that has been brewing for months. It is not an overnight problem, but it is an executive order-created problem when President Biden on day one got rid of some policies that were working incredibly well.

And every border patrol agent that I have talked—and I was on the border last week, Thursday and Friday, in McCollum, Texas, and in Donna, Texas, at the Donna processing facility—every border agent said the same thing. They said getting rid of the remain in Mexico policy, that one action alone opened up the floodgates to a surge, thousands of people a day crossing our border illegally.

Then you couple that with the deterioration of the Northern Triangle agreements. And, yes, it was President Trump who negotiated those agreements with Mexico, with Honduras, with El Salvador, with Guatemala. And maybe President Biden just doesn't like the fact that President Trump did

something that was working well. Why doesn't he renegotiate those agreements and call them his own? But they were working.

Madam Speaker, now today, it is so out of control that we have, for example, at the Donna processing facility, a facility designed for about a 250-person capacity—when I was visiting that facility last Friday, there was over 4,000 people—young kids, primarily—crammed into that facility, in those holding cells like sardines.

In fact, yesterday, we had a committee hearing with Dr. Fauci and CDC Director Walensky. And I asked them specifically about what is going on down at our southern border; showed them some of the pictures that have been taken.

And if you look at the CDC guidance that is out there on how we, as American citizens, have to conduct ourselves—if you own a restaurant, for example, whether it is in Baltimore, New Orleans, or anywhere else, if there is a capacity limit, and if that limit was 250 people, if there were 4,000 people in that restaurant, it would be shut down today. And I asked both Dr. Fauci and Dr. Walensky: Would that facility be in violation of CDC guidelines? And both of them said, Yes, in testimony under oath.

And then I talked to them about what is happening at our southern border. And I asked them: Are these conditions in compliance with CDC guidance? Both Dr. Fauci and Dr. Walensky said: No, this is not.

We talked about the Donna detention facility and the inhumane treatment of these young children by the Biden administration in that facility. And I asked Dr. Fauci: Is that facility, the conditions in which they are treating those young kids by the Biden administration in compliance with the CDC guidance? And Dr. Fauci said: No. And Dr. Walensky, the CDC director, testified the exact same way, that: No, those are not in compliance. And in fact, as we know, they are coming across from Mexico.

Do you know that the CDC guidance designates Mexico as the most dangerous nation right now? Along with probably a few others, but they are the most dangerous in terms of COVID transmission.

So CDC guidance encourages American citizens not to go to Mexico, but they say if you do come back from Mexico, you are mandated by the CDC to show a COVID-negative test before you, as an American citizen, can come back into the United States.

Do you know that not one of these people are being tested for COVID when they come in illegally across the Rio Grande from Mexico? And then many of them are being put on airplanes, without ID, being paid for mostly by the taxpayers—put on airplanes to fly off into cities all across the country. Border patrol agents have told us at least 15 percent of these people that crossed illegally are COVID-positive.

So I asked Dr. Walensky and I asked Dr. Fauci: Does that process by the Biden administration violate CDC's guidance on travel from Mexico? And they both testified that, yes, in fact, it does. That if they are getting on an airplane, they should be testing negative for COVID. None of them are, and in fact, some of them are known to be COVID-positive, being put on airplanes, flying to cities all across this country.

It is going on right now. It was going on Friday. About half the plane that I was on when I flew from McAllen back home had people with folders that said: I do not speak English, and it had a city on it. And it was multiple cities.

But this is what the Biden administration is doing in violation of CDC guidance that you and I have to follow, that our constituents who are seeing their livelihoods crushed, their restaurants closed down—many that won't open again ever—because they have to play by the rules that CDC and their States issue. And yet, the Biden administration is exempting themselves from this.

Madam Speaker, now we have legislation, I would like to bring up to the majority leader, that would fix this:

My colleague, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, requires that a COVID test be done before someone is released from CPB custody.

Ms. HERRELL wants to prohibit DHS from ceasing title 42.

There is a bipartisan bill by Mr. KATKO and Mr. CUELLAR, which establishes a regular migration surge border response fund.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he would bring those bills to the floor to address this crisis at the border that is not only a humanitarian crisis and a national security crisis, but it is a Biden-created crisis that is violating the very CDC guidance, according to Dr. Fauci, that American citizens have to follow.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we have a situation that is heart-wrenching and unacceptable. And it must be dealt with. In part, this situation comes because of the draconian policies of the previous administration.

It comes also because Republicans have refused, in both Houses, to come to agreement on a comprehensive immigration reform bill. So we have chaos as a result because our immigration system, as I believe almost every Member of your side of the aisle and every Member of my side of the aisle believes, is broken.

Now, unfortunately, what we see in that picture is broken systems causing great danger, apprehension, and fear among many people who are fleeing to America for refuge. It has, of course, Lady Liberty at the head of the harbor, the Hudson River, raises her torch and says, "That is what America is for."

Now, having said that, this situation is unacceptable. It is unacceptable for humanitarian reasons. It is unacceptable

able for the safety of not only those people that are in that picture, but for American citizens as well.

Madam Speaker, now it is my understanding that the CDC's existing pandemic public health order for closed borders is, in fact, being followed. In Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, California, unaccompanied children crossing the border are tested—are tested—by the Department of Health and Human Services. The migrants entering ICE facilities are tested, and they are quarantined if they test positive.

So protections are trying to be effective, and this administration is working very hard to ensure the safety of Americans and the safety of these many children who have come across the border.

□ 1245

None of them have been taken out of the arms of their parents. None of them have been made orphans by this administration.

I didn't hear the gentleman lamenting the fact that we had hundreds of children who had been taken out of the arms of their parents, and then they could not be found—that is, their parents. They could not be reunited with their parents.

This is a challenge. It is not a partisan challenge. It is a challenge for America. It is a challenge for us all.

This administration is working to try to come to a solution that is both humanitarian and effective. I am hopeful that they will proceed in accomplishing that objective.

The gentleman mentions the policies of the Trump administration, which substantially underfunded its own policies of trying to help the Northern Triangle countries. When I say help the triangle countries, unfortunately, the leadership of those countries, in too many instances, is not trying to help itself. So, we see panicked people fleeing.

Madam Speaker, I don't know whether the gentleman from Louisiana, my friend, Mr. SCALISE, saw the pictures of two children being dropped over the fence—by the way, that very large fence, billions of dollars of fence. Smugglers dropped two children over the fence. That is how secure it was.

The tragedy of those children being dropped over that fence alone, I don't care where they are from or who they are, but my faith teaches me that they may be strangers, but they are brothers and sisters.

In that context, we need to come to grips, and I am hopeful that the gentleman will support the administration's desire to get a comprehensive immigration bill adopted in this Congress.

In 2013, the Senate passed, Madam Speaker, a bill which was supported by Democrats and Republicans, 14 Republican Members of the United States Senate. We pleaded with the Republican leadership to bring that bill to the floor. They will say they brought a

bill to the floor, and they did bring a bill to the floor, and almost nobody thought it was effective in accomplishing the objective of having an immigration system that would work.

So, I tell the gentleman, the pictures that he is displaying ought to concern us all deeply. We ought to urge all of our colleagues to cooperate and work toward making sure that we don't have scenes like that and that we have the ability to deal with this surge at the border in a humane way.

But no one in the previous administration can wash their hands of the responsibility of creating a situation which—the gentleman says Mexico is adjudged to be one of the most dangerous nations on Earth for COVID-19. The previous administration said to people trying to seek solace and health and safety: Stay. Stay in the most dangerous nation on Earth for COVID-19.

I don't know whether that is a very humane policy. That is not a sanctuary for people who are in dire straits.

We said "no" to some people who came here from Germany. We said, no, you can't come in. Many of them returned in the 1930s and early 1940s and were slaughtered. They came here for sanctuary and found none.

That doesn't mean we can take everybody, but it does mean that we need to deal with it in a humanitarian way, in a way that honors our values and honors these people as our fellow human beings.

So, I tell the gentleman, in conclusion, that these are sad scenes, and we need to respond to them in a humanitarian way, but also a smart way. We need to respond to the cause as well as the effect.

Mr. SCALISE. As we talk about asylum, let's be clear, America has laws on how someone can seek asylum. I haven't seen anybody suggest that those laws are just repealed, and you just take somebody's word that if they say they want to come to America to seek asylum, to come in today and jump ahead of everyone else.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on the asylum issue?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Does the gentleman believe we ought to obey America's laws on asylum?

Mr. SCALISE. I think we ought to obey America's laws on immigration across the board. If you look at the asylum laws, there is a process to seek asylum.

In fact, every year, people are granted that asylum if they prove their case. That is where the law comes into play, which is being ignored right here.

What President Trump did when there was a surge in 2019, he confronted it, as a leader should do. He talked to people on the ground. He talked to our Border Patrol agents, who are the ones who have to deal with this crisis on a daily basis.

In fact, 40 percent of our Border Patrol agents tonight at midnight, like

Thursday night at midnight last week, when I was with those Border Patrol agents, 40 percent of them were pulled off of guarding our border, where their primary mission is to stop drug cartels from smuggling fentanyl, cocaine, and heroin into our country, which they are doing now at much higher levels, killing Americans all across the country.

Forty percent of them pulled away because they are going to be changing diapers in the Donna detention facility tonight because that is what they are being tasked to do by the Biden administration. That is not their job. It is not why they signed up. Their morale is incredibly low.

Well over roughly 90 percent of people who say they are coming here to seek asylum, those cases are rejected by the courts. Rejected. In fact, it is kind of hard to make an asylum claim here when the parents of many of these kids you are seeing here paid thousands of dollars to the drug cartels to smuggle their kids and themselves into the United States. It is hard to claim economic asylum, which is the case many of them plead, when you paid \$4,000 to try to come here illegally when there is a legal process to come here, not just the normal legal process where you can wait to come into America legally, where we let a million people into our country every year, the most generous nation in the world, America. But when they go around that system, that is where it overwhelms our system. That is what is going on right now.

President Trump confronted it, not by saying no one can come in, but by saying you have to follow our laws if you want to come here. If you want to seek asylum, you have to request it like everyone else. They allowed them to even come through South and Central American countries but stay in Mexico. Mexico agreed with this, and there was an orderly system. You got to hear your claim in a very expedient way.

Today, they are given a piece of paper when they come across the border illegally, saying: Come show up maybe 5 years from now.

Good luck with that. Then, they are given a free plane ticket, without an ID, to just be sent off to some other State. I saw manila envelopes, and once you got below the "I do not speak English," Dallas was on one, Philadelphia was on one, New Jersey was on one.

I don't know what is going to happen to them when they land in New Jersey if they can't speak English. What school system are they going to be placed in? Who is then going to be responsible for this breakdown at our southern border, which was created by President Biden, which he could fix today?

I have urged President Biden to go down to the border and see this for himself, to see how inhumane he is treating kids, in violation of his own

CDC guidelines, which Dr. Fauci verified yesterday.

If you read the child abuse and neglect laws of the State of Texas where this facility is, this is a violation of the child abuse and negligent laws at the President Biden-run facility.

Again, President Trump went and negotiated with Mexico, went and negotiated with those Northern Triangle countries to resolve the surge. This could be resolved as well, and you don't need to reinvent the wheel because there was a method for how to resolve it legally, using the legal system that America has.

Sure, I would agree it needs reforms, not an amnesty reform, where you send a magnet not only across South and Central America but around the world that America's borders are open, because that is the message today. As the gentleman knows, there are at least six people on the terrorist watch list who have come across America's southern border. I am not talking about from South and Central American countries, but from Middle Eastern countries, from Eastern European countries. Those are just the ones we know of that we have caught, and the Biden administration won't share that data with the media. The Biden administration wouldn't even let the press into this facility, which is a national disgrace.

I could imagine what the press would have said if the Trump administration was housing kids in a 33-person facility. There are over 400 crammed into a 33-person cell in the middle of a pandemic.

Again, Dr. Fauci said this violates every protocol there is when we are trying to get our economy reopened. Other countries have to control COVID, too, but in America, we are trying to control it.

Here is where the double standard and hypocrisy are driving people nuts. If any American citizen ran their business in America like this, they would be shut down by the Federal Government today. Yet, people can come here illegally, and the Biden administration is running this facility in violation of those very same guidances.

Do you know what happened to them? They are given a free airplane ticket, put on an airplane, possibly with COVID, and sent into some interior State of America. We don't even know where they are going. The Biden administration won't share that.

We have asked for a meeting, by the way. Our leadership team, Leader MCCARTHY and I, have asked for a meeting with President Biden to talk about this crisis, and he refuses to meet with us about it. Just ignoring a problem will not make it go away. If we are going to find a solution to this—again, I listed a number of bills, including some that are bipartisan, that would start solving this problem.

President Biden doesn't even want to go. He put Vice President HARRIS in charge of this mess, and she won't even

go down to the border, maybe because she doesn't want to be associated with President Biden's debacle.

She was put in charge of it. She is the Vice President of the United States. She has a responsibility to go down there. She should have gone there weeks ago, but she still hasn't been.

Maybe if they saw that, if they looked into the eyes of these young kids—one of the first girls we ran into might have been 10 years old, a girl in one of these cells, and she was crying. We asked her: Why are you crying? And she said: I don't want to be here.

She is an orphan. The gentleman talked about orphans. All of these kids, there are no parents with them. They don't want to be here. Many were crying because they are jammed into these cells for 20 hours a day, at least 15 percent with COVID, 6 inches apart, not 6 feet apart. That is what the Biden administration is doing right now.

President Trump fixed this problem. Again, if President Biden just doesn't like President Trump, call it his own name. We don't care. The template, if he doesn't want to do what actually worked, then do something else that works. But just doing this, it is not only a national disgrace, Dr. Fauci and Dr. Walensky said it is a violation of the CDC protocols that every American taxpayer has to follow. And they don't. Exempting themselves from a problem, but making everybody else comply with it, is no way to instill confidence in the American people.

I hope the President goes down there. I hope the President resolves this issue. He should meet with us. He said he wanted to unify the country. He said he wanted to work with everybody. It is time he starts following through on those promises.

Mr. HOYER. Donald Trump didn't fix the problem; he delayed the problem. That is what happened. That is what those pictures reflect.

He didn't fix the problem. He would say to those kids: Get out of here. Go back to Mexico. Maybe you have a parent there, maybe you have somebody who will take care of you, but get out of here.

That was one way to "solve" the problem, I presume. Those kids didn't go away. The fear that they have for being home didn't go away.

Now, I have said, Madam Speaker, this is something that we all need to deal with from a compassionate standpoint, from a legal standpoint, and from a human standpoint, which I guess is redundant to "compassionate." But the fact of the matter is that President Trump did not solve this problem; he simply delayed it.

When he left, the pressure was so great because they did not believe that this President would simply throw them to the wolves, take them from their parents, treat them as refuse.

We need to deal with this, and, hopefully, we will. Hopefully we will get comprehensive immigration reform.

I will say again that one of the reasons that we have the problem of not

adjudicating these people quickly is because we don't have enough judges. And the reason we don't have enough judges, which were included both in the 2013 bill and the subsequent reform bills, is because we haven't passed bills to provide the judges on the theory that if we don't provide the judges, then we won't be able to approve asylum and people won't be able to get in.

Madam Speaker, I am at the end of this circuitous argument.

□ 1300

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, these are children being thrown to the wolves, and it is not President Trump who is doing it. It could end, and I hope we can work together to solve this problem.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

UNIONIZATION

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting the Right to Organize, or PRO, Act.

In 1987, I was arrested for standing on a public sidewalk.

My crime?

I was seeking to help hospital workers organize with SEIU. That was one of many experiences I had demonstrating how American elections for workers to form a union are more like political elections in a dictatorship than in a democracy.

The recent union election at an Amazon warehouse in Alabama shows just how stacked the deck is against workers. It shows the power wielded by companies large and small and the lengths they will go to keep owners and executives reaping the benefits of growing productivity, even at the expense of their workers' very dignity.

It shows the urgent need for change. The Senate must send the PRO Act to the President's desk.

RECOGNIZING SIKH MASTER GURU TEGH BAHADUR

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the American and global Sikh community as they celebrate the 400th birth anniversary of their ninth Sikh Master Guru Tegh Bahadur.

Master Guru Tegh Bahadur lived a very meaningful life. He was one of the 10 gurus who founded Sikhism.

Islam was imposed during the reign of Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb. Hindu temples were destroyed and turned into mosques, and the emperor persecuted those who would not convert to Islamic law.

Guru Tegh Bahadur spoke out amid the persecution. He refused to convert to Islam and, in 1675, he was beheaded in Delhi. He is celebrated in the Sikh community because of his heroic efforts in defending religious freedoms. Because of his efforts to protect human rights, he is often referred to as Srishti Chadar, protector of humanity.

Madam Speaker, Master Guru Tegh Bahadur's memory inspires us to work even harder to support religious freedoms for everyone everywhere.

RECOGNIZING OFFICERS JEFFREY JOHNSON AND MICHAEL POLLACK

(Mr. MALINOWSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, as we mourn the victims of another senseless mass shooting in America, I rise to recognize two police officers in my district: Jeffrey Johnson and Michael Pollack of the Westfield Police Department, who prevented a potential mass shooting in my district in 2019.

On June 13 of that year, Officers Johnson and Pollack responded to a call at Tamaques Elementary School in Westfield, where they were met with a man armed with a .45-caliber gun, hollow-point bullets, and 130 rounds of ammunition; an arsenal much of which is not legal in New Jersey, but which he had obtained legally in another State.

The officers disarmed and arrested the man, potentially saving the lives of teachers, staff, and kids. The officers recently received the Hero Award from our Union County Prosecutor's Office, and I continue to honor their heroism here on the House floor today.

This incident is another reminder that while we have strong gun laws in New Jersey and one of the lowest rates of gun violence fatalities in the country, as a result, many of our neighboring States do not. As long as our gun laws are inconsistent across State lines, those who wish to commit mass murder will find the means to do so.

AMERICAN STEEL FOR AMERICAN INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, a long time ago, I made the decision to stand by the people who grow our food, protect our country, and make our stuff. Now, for a moment, if we could put aside the ever-expanding definition of infrastructure, I think we could agree on a basic principle: if we are going to ask American taxpayers to fund new American infrastructure, then we need to use American companies, American steel, and American labor.

It is especially important that American-made steel not be outsourced for fabrication to nations with lax environmental standards and lax labor